

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1, 4-20, 23-31, 34-43 were pending. Upon entry of this response amending claims 1, 20, 31, 42, and 43, claims 1, 4-20, 23-31, and 34-43 remain pending. Claims 1, 4-20, 23-26, and 34-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 1, 4-20, 23-26, and 34-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,614,861 issued to Pavlov (hereafter "Pavlov") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,764,766 issued to Spratte (hereafter "Spratte") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,205,553 issued to Stoffel et al. (hereafter "Stoffel"). Applicants aver that no new matter has been added in this response.

**Examiner Interview**

Applicants appreciate the telephone interview with Examiner on October 31, 2006 where claim amendments and the cited prior art were discussed.

**§112 Rejections**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-20, 23-26, and 34-43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Applicants have amended the claims to more clearly recite the claimed subject matter and submit that the objections are now moot.

**§103 Rejections**

**Claims 1, 20, 31, 42, and 43**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 20, 31, 42, and 43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Pavlov in view of Spratte, in further view of Stoffel. In the Office Action, the Examiner stated that Pavlov discloses a self-contained card that has the ability to verify a personal identification number entered into the card. The Examiner states that the card as disclosed by Pavlov outputs datum reproducing the at least a portion of a user's confidential datum if the access code equals the user access code, states that Spratte discloses a seed-based data generation module, and that Stoffel generates an output datum by processing a seed which reproduces at least a portion of the user's confidential datum, pointing to Figure 1, columns 11 and 12 *et seq.* of Pavlov, pointing to the abstract, columns 2-3 *et seq.* of Spratte, and points to

Figure 3, abstract, and column 1 *et seq.* of Stoffel. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Applicants submit that claims 1, 20, 31, 42, and 43 are allowable over Pavlov, Spratte, and Stoffel alone or in combination, as those references fail to disclose or suggest all the elements of amended claims 1, 20, 31, 42, and 43. For example, claim 1 recites in part “a seed-based data generation module...configured to generate an output datum by digitally processing [a] derived seed in accordance with [a] seed-access code relationship, wherein the output datum is a function of [an] input access code... said output datum having an appearance and reproducing at least a portion of said user’s confidential datum when said input access code equals said user’s access code...wherein for at least one input access code not equaling said user’s access code, said seed-based data generation module generates an invalid output datum having [an] appearance of said user’s confidential datum”, claim 20 recites in part “producing an output datum reproducing at least a portion of [a] user’s confidential datum when [an] input access code equals said user’s access code, wherein the output datum is a function of the input access code and comprises an appearance...wherein for at least one input access code not equaling said user’s access code, generating an invalid output datum having said appearance of said user’s confidential datum”, claim 31 recites in part “producing an output datum reproducing [ ] at least a portion of [a] user’s confidential datum if said input access code equals [a] user’s access code, wherein the output datum is a function of the input access code and comprises an appearance ...wherein for at least one input access code not equaling said user’s access code, generating an invalid output datum having said appearance of said user’s confidential datum, claim 42 recites in part “camouflaging at least a portion of [ ] access-controlled datum...allowing subsequent accessing of said at least a portion of said access-controlled datum via computer-based processing of an inputted access code, in accordance with said [a] generation indicia-access code relationship wherein said access-controlled datum comprises an appearance ...wherein for at least one inputted access code not equaling said user’s access code, generating an output datum that has said appearance of said access-controlled datum”, and claim 43 recites in part “generation-camouflaging at least a portion of said access-controlled datum such as to be reproducible by an authorized user thereof but non-reproducible by an unauthorized user thereof,

wherein said access-controlled datum comprises an appearance, wherein when an incorrect datum is entered, reproducing an invalid generation-camouflaged datum comprising said appearance of the user's access-controlled datum, wherein said output datum is a function of said input access code".

Pavlov discloses receiving a PIN from a user and comparing that PIN to a stored PIN and upon favorable comparison, generating a PIN validation signal that triggers the generation of a key, among other steps. It should be noted that a valid key is generated when the correct PIN is entered. Pavlov does not appear to disclose or suggest that an invalid key be generated when an incorrect PIN is entered. Thus, even if Pavlov's key output could be considered as teaching the claimed output datum and Pavlov's PIN could be considered as teaching the claimed user's access code, Pavlov does not teach all of the elements of the claim. For example, Pavlov does not disclose or suggest when an input access code not equaling a user's access code is entered, generating an invalid output datum having an appearance of a user's confidential datum as claimed.

Spratte does not make up for the claim elements not taught or suggested in Pavlov. For example, while Spratte discloses combining additional text, referred to as salt "S", to a primary secret key ( $K_p$ ) and the results are hashed to create an encryption key  $K_e$ , Spratte is not directed to considering user access codes. Furthermore, Spratte does not disclose or suggest generating an output datum that has the appearance of the user's confidential datum as claimed.

Stoffel does not make up for the claim elements not taught or suggested in Pavlov and Spratte. Stoffel discloses a device containing a digitally signed profile of the user for a given service. During access request, the user sends the digitally signed profile to the service provider who uses a public key to decrypt the digitally signed profile. The service provider compares the profile to a stored profile. The service provider sends a random number A to the apparatus. The apparatus uses an RSA algorithm and a secret key stored in the apparatus to calculate a value R. The service provider uses an RSA algorithm the R value and a secret key stored by the service provider to calculate an A value. If the A value calculated by the service provider is the same A value as sent to the apparatus access is allowed to the service provider.

In any of the three cases described above, *when an invalid input access code is used, an invalid output datum is not generated having an appearance of said user's confidential datum* (emphasis added). Even if something that the system generated could be interpreted as being an output datum, there does not appear to be anything in Pavolov, Spratte, and Stoffel alone or in combination that would suggest that such an output datum might take on an appearance of the user's confidential datum when other than the correct user access code is entered.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 1, 20, 31, 42, and 43 are allowable over the cited references.

Dependent claims 2-19, 21-30, and 32-41

Claims 4-19 which depend from claim 1, claims 21-30 which depend from claim 20, and claims 32-41 which depend from claim 31 are allowable for at least the reasons discussed in relation to claims 1, 20, 31, as well as the limitations they recite.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,



C. Bart Sullivan  
Reg. No. 41,516

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 415-576-0200  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
CBS:km  
60904900 v1